IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
APPELLATE SIDE

P. I. L. NO.57 OF 2005

Changdeo Wankhede ...Petitioner.
Vs.
Shri Vilasrao Deshmukh & Ors. ...Respondents.
....
Mr. Amin H. Solkar for the Petitioner.
Mr. N. P. Deshpande, Assistant Government Pleader for Respondent Nos.2 and 4.
Mr. R. M. Sawant for Respondent No.3.
.....

CORAM : DALVEER BHANDARI, C.J. &
DR.D.Y.CHANDRACHUD, J.

October 18, 2005.

P.C.

This petition has been filed by the President of Railway Zopadpatti Punarvasan Samiti, a registered body of the displaced slum dwellers. According to the Petitioner, on 28.2.2000, the Railway Ministry demolished the hutments based along the Harbour Railway Line who had settled there for more than a couple of decades, without any notice or prior intimation. The Petitioner further stated that about 22000 huts came to be demolished. The Petitioner prayed that the Respondents be directed to submit a report before this Court showing as to what steps have been taken for rehabilitating the families who were displaced in the demolition

which had taken place on 28.2.2000.

2. Pursuant to the order issued by this Court, Kedarnath Rao Ghorpade, Chief (Rehabilitation and Resettlement) Mumbai Metropolitan Region Development Authority, filed reply affidavit incorporating therein that the State Government has undertaken the execution of the project known as the Mumbai Urban Transport Project for improvement of the Rail and Road infrastructure in the City of Mumbai. He has mentioned in the affidavit that Rs.480/- crores have been earmarked for rehabilitation and resettlement of about 23000 project affected families. He has further mentioned that MMRDA has constructed permanent tenements to accommodate about 23000 project affected families. They have been provided all necessary amenities and facilities. He has mentioned that the demolitions carried out on 28.2.2000 pertained to those who were within 10 metres of the railway line and that the demolitions were carried out pursuant to the orders of the High Court in Writ Petition No.1781 of 1998. During the course of the hearing, the learned Counsel for Respondent No.3 has categorically mentioned that all eligible slum dwellers have been rehabilitated.

3. In view of the said affidavit and the statement of the learned Counsel, no further directions are necessary and this petition is accordingly dismissed.

CHIEF JUSTICE

DR. D.Y. CHANDRACHUD, J.